

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-11101-2025
Date of Decision: 04.03.2025

ARUN RAJPUT ALIAS ANKUPetitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Gaurav Kalsi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition under Section 482 BNSS, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.19 dated 18.02.2025 under Sections 132, 221, 191(3), 190, 126(2), 351(3) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Division No.1, district Pathankot.

2. On 27.02.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Arun Rajput alias Anku aged 32 years	19	18.02.2025	132, 221, 191(3), 190, 126(2), 351(3) of BNS, 2023	Division No.1	Pathankot

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the alleged incident took place on 29.01.2025 and the FIR was registered on 18.02.2025, i.e. after the period of about 21 days. Counsel further submits that the FIR was registered after a considerable delay, and that too, after acquiring the particulars of the petitioner and the other accused, a concocted version is introduced in the F.I.R.
3. He also submits that, had any such incident happened, same would have been recorded in the CCTV footage camera installed in the

hospital. Therefore, the version given in the FIR can be verified from the CCTV footage, also.

Thus, due to the false implication of the petitioner, counsel for the petitioner prays for the grant of anticipatory bail in the present case.

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On advance notice, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, appears on behalf of the respondent State, and submits that the accused in the present case are involved in various criminal activities. He further adds that the petitioner is also implicated in five other criminal cases.*

6. *Adjourned to 04.03.2025.*

Let a status report be filed by the learned State counsel, confirming the identity of the petitioner and other accused persons through the CCTV footage, if available.”

3. Status report dated 03.03.2025 by way of affidavit of Sumeer Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division City, District Pathankot, has been filed on behalf of respondent-State, the same is taken on record.

4. As per para 5(vii) of the status report, there is CCTV footage in which some part of the incident found recorded, whereby it can be clearly seen that petitioner entered the premises of the duty/emergency room of Civil Hospital, Pathankot, and create ruckus by filming the complainant and even seen threatening the complainant and other staff persons.

Also, from the paragraph 7 of the status report, it is noticed that petitioner is involved in several other instances of different nature of crimes, even causing interference in the duties being performed by the government official, allegations are also there in the FIR No.116 dated 27.09.2020.

In one of the cases under Section 379, 411 IPC, it is reported that the petitioner has already been convicted.

5. Looking at the allegations levelled by the complainant, who is a woman doctor in government institute and the explanation given in the

status report by the State, this Court does not find any reason to entertain the plea of grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Hence, the present petition stands **dismissed**.

March 04, 2025
Sangeeta

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No